

DRAFT

Wisconsin Program Enhancement Plan

Progress Report for Quarter 3

May 2005 – July 2005

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services

Division of Children and Family Services

Submitted September 1, 2005

To:

Federal Administration for Children and Families

Wisconsin PEP Progress Report for Quarter 3

Contents

	Page
Introduction	2
PEP Implementation Team Activities	3
General PEP Updates	5
Quarter 3 Accomplishments	6
Quarter 3 Accomplishments/Quarter 4 Activities	8
Quarter 4 Activities	18
PEP Data	21
Changes to PEP Matrix	30

Attachments:

1. PEP Implementation Team 6/15/05 agenda
2. National resource center utilization summary
3. Draft memo on sibling placement rate incentive
4. Draft Access Standard and appendices
5. Draft memo on permanency planning procedures
6. Draft memo on sibling placement
7. DCFS Memo 2005-06 on family interaction policy
8. Draft memo on ICWA notification
9. DHFS tribal consultation policy
10. Focus group results on barriers to engagement
11. Draft policy on face-to-face contact
12. Adoption readiness form
13. Results from limited case reviews
14. Recurrence of maltreatment analysis
15. Updated PEP Matrix

Introduction

This progress report describes Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) implementation activities completed during May 1, 2005 through July 31, 2005, which is the third quarter of the two-year PEP period. The report also describes planned activities that will occur during the fourth quarter of August 1, 2005 through October 31, 2005. Since PEP action steps have benchmark tasks occurring in successive quarters, the narrative for most items covers both the accomplishments in the most recent quarter and planned activities in the next quarter.

The PEP is administered by the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the state child welfare agency within the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The PEP is being implemented with the cooperation and participation of county and tribal child welfare agencies and other stakeholders on the PEP Implementation Team.

The progress report refers to Action Steps in the PEP, as approved by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF), to respond to the findings of the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) of Wisconsin. The Action Steps are described in the Matrix portion of the PEP. An updated PEP Matrix reflecting changes for Quarter 3 is attached to this progress report. The complete PEP and information about the PEP process is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP.htm>

PEP Contact Person:

John Tuohy, Planning Director
Division of Children and Family Services
1 W. Wilson Street, Room 550
Madison, WI 53708-8916
Phone 608-267-3832
Fax 608-266-6836
Email tuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us

PEP Implementation Team Activities

The PEP Implementation Team was formed in August 2004 and the first meeting was held on November 29, 2004. The Implementation Team was created as a collaborative, cross-systems approach to guide planning and implementation of child welfare practice and policy in order to achieve the federal performance outcomes and enhance services to Wisconsin's children and families. The Implementation Team is comprised of over 80 individuals representing a wide array of diverse fields, including domestic abuse, schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, state courts, health care, mental health, substance abuse, and child protective services. In addition, the Implementation Team has representation from foster and adoptive parents, tribes, advocacy groups and state legislators.

The PEP Implementation Team held its third meeting on June 16, 2005 (agenda is attached). The June meeting included discussion of Quarter 2 accomplishments, the selection process for county case reviews, the Child and Family Services Plan, and PEP committee reports. The Implementation Team was also briefed on connections between early childhood education and child welfare, the Title IV-E eligibility review, federal budget and policy developments, implementation of the Subsidized Guardianship waiver, and use of the PEP Bulletin Board to obtain input on PEP-related policies and procedures. The next Implementation Team meeting will take place on August 31, 2005. The Implementation Team meetings are held quarterly and broadcast on the Internet to allow remote participation. Information about the Implementation Team is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP-Team/pepTeam.htm>

The PEP Implementation Team utilizes the following PEP committees to help shape the policies, procedures, and practices needed to complete the twenty (20) Action Steps identified in the Wisconsin PEP. The Executive Committee held its first meeting in February 2005 and meets quarterly to set agendas for full Implementation Team meetings. The other PEP committees held their first meetings in January or February 2005 and are meeting monthly during calendar year (CY) 2005. The PEP committees have the following responsibilities:

- **PEP Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee of the full PEP Implementation Team will meet between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long-term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.

- **Child Welfare Case Process**

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee will clarify and develop policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In addition, this Committee will address issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and service systems.

-

Out-of-Home Care

The Out-of-Home Care Committee will enhance policies, practices, and procedures related to Out-of-Home Placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).

- **Adoption Services**

The Adoption Services Committee will develop and update policies, practices, and procedures related to Concurrent Permanency Planning, Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), Adoption, Adoption Search, and Adoption Assistance payments.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement**

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee will design and implement a county review process including a CFSR-style case review model and identify the management and program information needs of counties and tribes for child welfare data reports.

In addition, for PEP Action Steps and other policy issues that involve tribal child welfare or child welfare staff and provider training, the existing Indian Child Welfare Coordination Group and State Training Council will be consulted by the PEP Implementation Team for expertise and guidance. Training updates are provided at PEP Implementation Team meetings.

To facilitate public input on policies and procedures related to PEP action steps, DCFS created the PEP Bulletin Board for materials developed by PEP committees to be available for public comment. The availability of the Bulletin Board has been publicized to counties, tribes and other key stakeholders. The Bulletin Board can be accessed at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/bulletinBrd.htm>

General PEP Updates

PEP Budget Issues

Implementation of several PEP items, including the CQI county case review process, the Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center, policy development and technical assistance activities, and expansion of the child welfare training system, received continued state funding in the 2005–2007 biennial budget period. The Governor’s 2005-2007 budget bill, 2005 Wisconsin Act 25, was signed into law on July 25, 2005 and included continued funding for these PEP items at the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2005 level.

National Resource Centers

The PEP includes plans to utilize several of the federally-funded national resource centers to provide assistance to Wisconsin over the two-year PEP period. Attached with this report is a summary of DCFS’ use of the national resource centers during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 and expected use during FFY 2006.

Quarter 3 Accomplishments

The following is a summary of the activities completed during the PEP Quarter 3 period of May 1, 2005 to July 31, 2005. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

1. Rate Incentive for Siblings (E.2.) (see attachment)

The Services to Foster Families workgroup of the Out-of-Home Care Committee agreed that the Exceptional Rate component of the Uniform Foster Care Rate should be used to help support siblings being placed together in foster homes. The first step to encouraging agencies to use the exceptional rate to support sibling placement is to communicate that the application of the exceptional rate is within the scope and purpose of the Uniform Foster Care Rate Policy. An explanation of this issue and justification for using the exceptional rate to support sibling placement was included in the numbered memo about documentation of sibling placement that was drafted by the Birth Family Involvement workgroup.

As the PEP continues, the Services to Foster Families workgroup will be recommending additional modifications to existing policy to formalize the use of the exceptional rate to support the placement of siblings.

2. Tribal Child Welfare (G.2)

Indian Child Welfare Consultant. The DCFS has reopened the process to hire an Indian Child Welfare Consultant to work with tribes and counties regarding issues related to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), other state and federal laws, and tribal involvement in all child welfare-related policies and programs. A primary responsibility of this position will be to work with tribal, county, and state staff in implementing the seven tribal priorities included as an appendix to the PEP and the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan. The position is being advertised and the first round of interviews will be held for all of those eligible individuals who submitted applications on or before September 6, 2005.

3. Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center (K.3.)

As of July 2005, all of the Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center staff have been hired and are working in their respective offices. The staff of the Resource Center held open house events at Adoption Resources of Wisconsin offices in May, at St. Aemilian-Lakeside offices in Sheboygan in June, and at PATH, Wisconsin, Inc. offices in July. The Resource Center has developed its web site and is continually gathering and adding information. For information about the scope and services of the Resource Center, visit their web site at: <http://www.wifostercareandadoption.org>

In addition, Resource Center staff have been meeting with key stakeholders, including the Wisconsin Foster and Adoptive Parent Association, the St. Croix tribe, foster care coordinators groups statewide, and other groups to discuss their priorities for the Resource Center and disseminate information about the Resource Center activities. The Resource Center, based upon a request from the statewide foster care coordinators association, is developing a template newsletter for foster parents and agency staff with statewide information and space for local information and updates. The second quarterly Advisory Council meeting was held at the end of July, in association with the final grand opening event.

4. Limited Case Reviews (Q.2) (see attachment)

In accordance with the PEP goal to collect additional case review results using the Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) protocol to compare with the baseline data from the August 2003 federal review, reviewers completed limited case reviews in three counties utilizing the CFSR review instrument. In Quarter 2, Peter Watson, Director of the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, came to Wisconsin to train over 35 persons in the application of the federal CFSR case review instrument. Limited case reviews using only the case review instrument and no stakeholder interviews were completed in Dodge County during the week of May 10-12, 2005; Jackson County during the week of July 12-15, 2005; and the Cross Plains office of Dane County during the week of July 26-29, 2005. A total of 29 cases were reviewed.

The results of the limited case reviews will be compared with the 50 cases from the August 2003 federal review of Wisconsin to determine if any of the baseline performance levels for the PEP should be updated. See the data section of this report for more detail.

5. Training System Capacity Building (R.4)

In May 2005, DCFS contracted with the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison to develop distance learning alternatives for pre-service and in-service training for child welfare caseworkers. Currently, DoIT is working to develop a “beta module” which will serve as a model for the remaining pre-service web-based training sessions.

Pre-service content is being developed under the supervision of the state curriculum coordinator for the training system (a contracted position created as a result of the Program Enhancement Plan). As of July 31, 2005, four workgroups have convened to develop separate modules for pre-service training. In addition to pre-service module development, the curriculum coordinator is working with the five regional and tribal partnerships to help them meet their development deadlines on PEP related training projects.

6. BPP Policy Staff Development (S.1)

New BPP policy staff have been actively involved in all PEP related projects. The two new CPS Policy Specialists, Kim Eithun and Nicole Grice, are actively involved in workgroups associated with the Child Welfare Case Process Committee, writing policy related to their assigned areas, and providing training through regional roundtables on newly issued policy. In addition, Nicole chairs a workgroup related to permanency planning as a part of the Out-of-Home Care Committee.

Cathy Connolly, Policy and Legislation Consultant, is involved with the Out-of-Home Care Committee and leads activities for the Birth Family Involvement workgroup. Tracey Theise-Hover, Child Welfare Case Practice Consultant, is involved with both the Child Welfare Case Process Committee and the Continuous Quality Improvement Committee.

Quarter 3 Accomplishments / Quarter 4 Activities

1. Access Standard (A.1) (see attachment)

The drafts of the Access Standard and Appendices were reviewed statewide in Q3 by county and tribal directors, supervisors and line staff, and other key stakeholders. The Access Standard and the Appendices will provide more clarity and direction to CPS staff around documenting, screening, and response time decisions. The comments received through the review process were assessed and incorporated into revised documents.

The revised drafts of the Access Standard and Appendices were posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for further review and comment during the month of August. The drafts of the Access Standard and Appendices will be reviewed by the Wisconsin County Human Services Association (WCHSA) in September. The Access Standard will be issued by October (Quarter 4).

The eWiSACWIS system was changed in December 2004 to allow a protective services report and a services intake to be interchanged before supervisory approval of the intake. As the Access Standard was developed, it became clear that further system changes would aid CPS caseworkers in streamlining access-related work by creating a single Access Report versus the current multiple types of intakes. The process to modify CPS and child welfare service intakes in the eWiSACWIS system began in August 2005 by establishing a series of meetings with the eWiSACWIS design team to conceptualize the enhancements needed to support the Access Standard. The system change is extensive and is scheduled for the March 2006 maintenance release (Quarter 6). The enhancement will include using one document to gather information at the first point of contact. The supervisor will then have the ability to assign the assessment process most suitable for the Access Report, for either CPS or child welfare services.

2. Multiple Reports and Allegations (A.2.)

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee devoted Section VII of the Access Standard to describing how to handle multiple reports on open cases. The delineation of how reports will be handled provides guidelines to ensure a report on the same conditions is incorporated into the

current report and passed on to the appropriate worker. This is being reviewed statewide and will be issued as a part of the Access Standard in Quarter 4.

3. Safety Assessment and Plan Policy (B.1)

BPP has contracted with ACTION for Child Protection to assist in the development of Safety Intervention Standards. These Standards will focus on safety assessment and planning from Initial Assessment through case closure in Ongoing Services.

The Safety Standards will need to be issued in Q5 rather than in Q4. These Standards will introduce new concepts and practices for CPS staff as they assess and manage child safety. The changes in the Safety Standards will be a large shift in practice and issuing them in the same quarter as the Access Standard (which also makes major changes to current practice) could overwhelm CPS staff and result in further confusion about safety assessment and management. Also, issuing the Safety Standards in Q5 will be closer to the actual eWiSACWIS release regarding changes to the safety assessment and plan, and therefore better support implementation of the standards by caseworkers.

4. Targeted Case Reviews (C.1 and C.2)

The team of CQI staff completed a targeted case review of 200 cases selected from the counties of Dane, Rock, Sheboygan and Winnebago to assess factors affecting the state's re-entry and placement stability rates. These counties were selected based on eWiSACWIS outcome reports showing high re-entry rates or frequent placement changes. The review was conducted using data collected from eWiSACWIS and contacts with the counties, as necessary.

A workgroup comprised of CQI and DCFS planning and policy staff has begun to compile the results of the review. A full analysis of the review results will be completed by September 2005 and will address agency practice, policy and documentation considerations and program resource implications. Additional areas to be considered for further study will also be identified.

The results of the Targeted Case Review will be shared with the directors of the participating county agencies, the PEP Out-of-Home Care Committee, the BPP policy development staff, and other key stakeholder groups in Quarter 4.

5. Concurrent Permanency Planning (D.1)

During Quarter 3, the Adoption Services Committee completed the final draft of the numbered memo on the Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline which identifies who needs to be involved, when and for what purpose. Both the Continuous Permanency Consultation timeline and the associated numbered memo are moving forward for approval and dissemination.

In Quarter 4, the Division will provide training regionally to supervisors of the county staff involved in developing the permanency plan and associated court reports. In addition, the 13 State Permanency Consultants will jointly provide training to county out-of-home care staff as a regular

part of their consultation process. We have developed a training team for each region and a timeline that will have us completing all training by early November 2005.

6. Permanency Planning Procedures (D.2 and D.4) (see attachment)

Administrative Rule. The DCFS, in conjunction with the Director of State Courts Office, has completed the initial working draft of a proposed administrative rule (Ch. HFS 44) on reasonable efforts and permanency planning. The process for issuing the administrative rule is described in PEP Action Step N.1 and began in Quarter 3.

DCFS Numbered Memo. While the rule process is underway, DCFS has developed a draft numbered memorandum on *Current Federal and State Requirements for Permanency Plan Content and Procedures* which contains clarification on definitions, procedures, and content of initial and subsequent permanency plans, permanency plan reviews, permanency plan hearings, and transition plans for independent living. The memorandum also includes a discussion of the authority to enable TPR prior to identification of an adoptive resource, and application of exceptions to the reasonable efforts requirements.

The draft memorandum was reviewed by the PEP Out-of-Home Care Committee on July 28, 2005. The Committee requested specific changes to the draft which DCFS is in the process of making. The revised memo will be issued by the end of Quarter 4.

A separate memorandum on definitions of "difficult to place" and "at-risk" children is currently being drafted for review by DCFS staff and PEP committees.

Permanency Plan Review Report. The DCFS implemented a statewide permanency plan review report template in the June 2005 eWiSACWIS maintenance release. This template will assure that all reviews conducted by administrative review panels include all of the appropriate determinations and recommendations to the court required by state and federal law. DCFS is developing a numbered memo that will be issued in Quarter 4 to provide instructions for local agency use of the permanency plan review report template.

Training on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning. The DCFS is continuing to work with the National Resource Center on Legal and Judicial Issues to schedule on-site consultation to assist in developing training curricula on permanency planning related issues for judges, district attorneys, corporation counsel, and child welfare agency staff. In addition, the Child Welfare Training Partnerships will conduct train the trainer sessions in Quarter 4 on the curricula for state, tribal, and county staff to allow those staff to train other staff in their agencies. The sessions will start in Quarter 4 to coincide with issuance of the DCFS Numbered Memo.

7. Informational Materials for Permanency Plan Reviewers (D.3)

The Permanency Planning Workgroup of the PEP Out-of-Home Care (OHC) Committee is in the process of gathering information from other states to use as guidelines for the development of informational materials for permanency plan reviewers in Wisconsin. The workgroup determined that it would be helpful to survey all counties regarding their use of administrative review panels,

whether they provide training, and related topics. The survey is currently being piloted in approximately six (6) counties and was sent to all counties as a final document in late August 2005.

The Committee has also recommended the development of a permanency plan reviewer handbook. Most of the content of the handbook will be developed by DCFS staff in consultation with the Out-of-Home Care Committee since a majority of the material will be uniform for all panels in the state. Each county will be able to “localize” the handbook to reflect local policies or procedures in their county. A draft of the booklet will be discussed by the Out-of-Home Care Committee at its meeting in September 2005.

8. Foster and Adoptive Family Assessments (D.5)

The Adoption Services Committee is currently working on the assessment tool and process to integrate foster and adoptive family assessments. On July 13, 2005, Kate Cleary gave a presentation on the SAFE study process used in California and 20 other states. Over 80 state, county, tribal, and private agency staff attended the information session. The SAFE family assessment tool is currently posted on the PEP bulletin board for review and comment. The comments DCFS has received so far have been positive. The SAFE tool will be discussed in more detail at the August 16 meeting of the Adoption Services Committee and at the August 31 PEP Implementation Team meeting.

9. Documentation of Sibling Placement (E.1.) (see attachment)

The latest draft of the Numbered Memo on Documentation of Sibling Placement was submitted to the entire Out-of-Home Care Committee for consideration. The Committee requested revisions and a second review opportunity before the policy was placed on the PEP Bulletin Board. The Birth Family Workgroup and eWiSACWIS Project Team have identified a location in e-WiSACWIS for documenting placement efforts and a request to modify the screen will be made as soon as the OHC Committee reaches consensus on the Numbered Memo.

The OHC Committee developed a strategy for implementing the sibling placement policy (benchmark E.1.b.). Technical assistance will be provided to the counties through policy discussions at regional CPS Supervisor meetings that include delinquency supervisors and foster care coordinators and at Inter-tribal child welfare meetings with DCFS. Additional assistance will be provided within the best practices attachment to the policy memo. More formal training will be provided through inclusion within the CPS and Foster Parent Handbook which is being developed. The policy will be incorporated into pre-service training for both foster parents and CPS caseworkers. It will also be incorporated into one of the CORE training modules and Chapter 48 intake training. The Tribal Training Partnership will be encouraged to incorporate the information into tribal child welfare training. The Northeast Training Partnership is actively developing training on sibling placement.

In addition, DCFS is considering revising the foster care licensing administrative rule, Ch. HFS 56, to reflect the sibling placement policy. If pursued, this revision to Ch. HFS 56 will be packaged with the proposed rule revision under Benchmark E.3.

10. Family Interaction Policy (F.1.a.) (see attachment)

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee has developed a policy on family interaction that promotes visitation and other interaction with mothers, fathers, and siblings. Throughout Quarter 3, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee reviewed the draft policy. In addition, the policy was posted twice to the PEP Bulletin Board for further feedback/comments. In June, the policy was sent to WCHSA for review and revisions were made based on those comments. The family interaction policy was issued on an interim basis through a DCFS Numbered Memo on July 27, 2005. Ultimately, the family interaction policy will be incorporated into the revisions of the Ongoing Services Standards under Action Step N.

During Quarter 4, BPP staff will provide training/technical assistance to child welfare supervisors and caseworkers. BPP will hold a total of twelve (12) roundtables across the state, with two sessions being held in each location. In addition, BPP will webcast one of the Madison sessions to allow people who could not attend one of the roundtable sessions to participate either via the webcast or view the session at a later date. The Child Welfare Case Process Committee has not identified a need for eWiSACWIS modifications under Benchmark F.1.a.5 for the interim policy. System modifications will be considered again when the Ongoing Service Standards are revised

11. ICWA Notification (F.2) (see attachment)

In order to improve timely and accurate identification of Indian children in the child welfare system and assure compliance with the tribal notification requirements of the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA), four templates were developed in conjunction with the Tribal Child Welfare Coordination Group. These templates have been available for statewide use since December 2004 and are currently being used by child welfare staff in the state. The templates were introduced to CPS supervisors at a statewide meeting held in December 2004. An ICWA training curriculum was developed by the Inter-Tribal Child Welfare Training Partnership in collaboration with the Milwaukee Training Partnership. The curriculum was piloted in Milwaukee at the beginning of Quarter 3. The curriculum is being reviewed and will be finalized for statewide use in Quarter 4.

A DCFS Numbered Memo has been drafted to provide direction on use of the templates. The memo was drafted in Quarter 1 and received wide review, including formal review by WCHSA. In further discussions of WCHSA's recommendations for revision of the memo, some substantive issues were raised. These issues require further study to assure that new practice and documentation requirements are well targeted to achieve the essential goal of timely and accurate identification of Indian children. Therefore, the policy memo will not be issued until Quarter 4. The templates continue to be available for local agency use.

12. Tribal Child Welfare (G.1) (see attachment)

Tribal Consultation Policy. The Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) adopted a policy effective March 10, 2005 related to consultation with tribes. DCFS and other DHFS staff

met with tribal staff in Quarters 2 and 3 on human services and health issues and will continue to meet in Quarter 4. The discussions will result in an implementation plan for the DHFS tribal consultation policy. The first priority will be the development of a curriculum to be used in training DHFS staff on issues related to Indian culture, sovereignty, relationships with the state and counties, and related topics. A draft of that curriculum has been established and the DHFS workgroup is in the process of developing a schedule for the provision of the training to DHFS staff.

ICWA Requirements. DCFS has included in its fall legislative package, the proposal that ICWA be incorporated into Wisconsin statutes in Ch. 48 (the Children's Code) and Ch. 938 (the Juvenile Justice Code). This is one of the seven tribal priorities included in the PEP and the five-year Child and Family Service Plan, and thus has the support of the Wisconsin tribal child welfare program managers.

13. Policy on Sharing Information with Relatives and Potential Caregivers (H.2)

A draft Information Memo identifying information that can be shared with relatives has been developed and was submitted to the Out-of-Home Care Committee at its July 28, 2005 meeting. The Committee requested revisions, particularly with regard to differences between emergency and planned placements where parents or guardians are available to the caseworker. OHC Committee members will provide the revised draft memo to their Corporation Counsels or District Attorneys for review and report back to the OHC Committee at the next meeting in late August. The memo is in preliminary draft form and the final memo will be issued in Quarter 4.

The DCFS has recommended that a statutory change be pursued to allow relatives to receive the same information as licensed foster parents.

14. Relative Placement Survey (H.4.)

A draft Relative Placement Survey was reviewed by the OHC Committee which requested changes. The survey focuses on barriers to using relatives as placement resources. The Committee also discussed how to distribute the survey to obtain the most complete response from counties and tribes. OPEP identified a PEP report (the Sibling Placement Report) that will provide data on the extent to which relatives are currently being used for placements. Changes to the survey were completed and distributed at the end of August 2005.

15. Barriers to Engagement (J.3.a.) (see attachment)

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee is responsible for determining barriers to engagement of families. As a way of doing this, the committee was asked to conduct regional focus groups with child welfare caseworkers and a total of 10 focus groups were held across the state during Quarter 3. A summary of the focus group results is attached. During Q4, the committee will review the focus group results to develop recommendations for actions that could be taken to address barriers identified in the focus groups.

16. Caseworker-Parent/Family Face-to-Face Contact Policy (J.4.) (see attached)

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee has developed a policy on face-to-face contact by caseworkers with parents/family. During Quarter 3, the committee drafted the policy and posted it to the PEP Bulletin Board. In Quarter 4, the committee will continue to review and revise the draft policy. In addition, the policy has been posted a second time to the Bulletin Board for further feedback. The Committee the draft in August and the policy will be sent to WCHSA for review in September. This policy will be issued on an interim basis as a DCFS Numbered Memo by the end of October 2005 (Quarter 4) and become effective at the end of January 2006 (Quarter 5). Ultimately, the face-to-face contact policy will be incorporated into the revisions of the Ongoing Services Standards under Action Step N.

17. Managed Care in Milwaukee (L.1)

DCFS is collaborating with the Division of Health Care Financing (DHCF) to pilot a program in Milwaukee County for provision of Medicaid-covered services to children in foster care, court-ordered Kinship Care, and subsidized adoptions using a managed care organization (MCO). The MCO staff will work with the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) to develop comprehensive assessments and service plans for physical, mental, and dental health service needs.

Abri Health Plan, a new Medicaid HMO, was issued an intent to contract letter by the DHCF based on the recommendation of the RFP evaluation committee. Contract negotiations are currently underway with the goal of having a contract in place by Fall 2005 and implementation of services in early 2006. A Milwaukee community advisory committee is being established to participate in implementation of the managed care program.

Abri plans to contract with Wraparound Milwaukee to oversee the behavioral health services for children. Wraparound Milwaukee, a program within the Milwaukee County Health and Human Service Department, provides mental health care to children with serious emotional and mental health needs. Wraparound Milwaukee already has a network of therapists and other professionals as well as services such as crisis intervention. BMCW will work with Abri on the mental health screening and assessment tools used to develop service plans.

18. Ch. HFS 44, Administrative Rule on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning (N.1)

A second draft of the Proposed Order for HFS 44 has been submitted to the DHFS Rules Coordinator for review. The Statement of Scope for HFS 44 was published by the Revisor of Statutes in July 2005, indicating the intent of DCFS to promulgate the rule. Once the internal DHFS review is completed, the draft rule will be circulated to counties, tribes, judges and legal staff, and other stakeholders for input.

Some of the permanency planning provisions in Ch. HFS 44 will be provided to local agencies through the DCFS Numbered Memo that will be issued in Quarter 4 under Benchmarks D.2 and D.4.

19. Ongoing Services Standards (N.2.)

A workgroup of the Case Process Committee has been formed to work on revisions to the Ongoing Services Standards, specifically in the areas of family assessment and case planning. Preliminary revisions have been made by DCFS and a draft circulated for committee review. Based upon feedback, changes were made and the draft was provided for continued review and revision to the committee at their August 2005 meetings. A draft of the Ongoing Service Standards will be posted to the bulletin board for statewide review by October 31, 2005. Comments will inform further revisions to the draft, which will then be submitted to WCHSA for formal review in December 2005. The revised Standards will be issued in January 2006 and become effective in June 2006 to coincide with eWiSACWIS system changes to the family assessment and case plan.

20. Availability of Adoptive Resource (O.1) (see attachment)

The Adoption Services Committee developed a form to assess the readiness of children for adoption to facilitate the permanency planning process. This form (attached) will be used with the Continuous Permanency Planning timeline (see Step D.1) as part of the Permanency Consultation process. The draft form is currently posted to the PEP bulletin board for public comment. The final form will be issued in Quarter 4 using a DCFS Information Memo. The information memo has been drafted and is awaiting final approval. Specific language related to the Indian Child Welfare Act requested by tribal staff was added.

DCFS has reviewed state statutes and administrative rules and determined that neither statute nor rule prohibit termination of parental rights in the absence of an identified adoptive resource. This has been communicated to counties at the regional level by state permanency consultants. The clarification will be included in the informational memo for the adoption readiness form.

The Adoption Services Committee will, at its next meeting, develop a training plan for the adoption readiness document and the Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline under Benchmark O.3.

21. Training on Permanency Plan Reviews and Hearings (O.2)

DCFS, in conjunction with the Director of State Courts Office, has been consulting with the National Resource Center on Legal and Judicial Issues on the development of a curriculum for training judges, county agency managers and supervisors, district attorneys and corporation counsel, and other actors in the child welfare system. DCFS is planning an initial pilot training for August 29, 2005 which will involve selected judges, staff of the Child Welfare Training Partnerships, and other individuals. The purpose of this training will be to fine-tune the curriculum for training later in the year for judges at their meetings in each of Wisconsin's ten (10) judicial districts.

22. Concurrent Planning Timeline (O.3)

The Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline is complete and the DCFS Numbered Memo is currently in the approval process. The Adoption Services Committee, at its August 16 meeting, will develop a training plan for the timeline and the Adoption Readiness Form.

Note: The Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline was submitted with the Quarter 2 PEP Progress Report.

23. DCFS Memo on IV-E for Legal Services (O.5)

To stimulate additional counties to participate in the Title IV-E for Legal Services program, DCFS staff have been actively promoting the program in discussions with county directors. The memo has been revised and is currently going through the DCFS approval process. It is anticipated that the memo will be issued in September 2005 upon completion of the review process. At regional meetings, DCFS continues to remind counties about the opportunity to participate in the IV-E reimbursement program.

24. Survey on Participation in Court and Permanency Plan Reviews (P.3)

This survey of foster parents was scheduled to begin in Quarter 3 and continue on an ongoing basis. The Out-of-Home Care Committee had many tasks to address in Quarter 3, so the survey was discussed at the August 2005 meeting. Implementation of the survey will occur later in Quarter 4.

25. Statewide CQI Case Review Model (Q. 3)

During the week of June 20-24, 2005, the CQI team, with peer reviewers from Wisconsin, shadowed a QSR review team in La Crosse County. This review was led by Paul Vincent of The Child Welfare Policy & Practice Group located in Alabama. The lead QSR reviewers were brought in from the states of Alabama, Florida, and Iowa. Prior to this review, the same case reviewers participated in a similar review of Dodge County using the federal CFSR protocol. The feedback from the reviews and the recommendations of the case reviewers were shared at the Statewide CQI Committee meeting on June 28, 2005.

The statewide CQI Committee voted unanimously to adopt the Quality Service Review (QSR) as the child welfare case review protocol for the case review process for county child welfare agencies. At the current time, BMCW utilizes a different case review protocol as agreed to within the Jeanine B. lawsuit settlement agreement. DCFS will continue to study how the QSR protocol could be used in Milwaukee.

The QSR design team met from July 19-21, 2005 to start “Wisconsinizing” the QSR protocol. Design team meetings were held to start the review of the QSR protocol used by other states to meet Wisconsin’s needs. Experts from multiple disciplines including child welfare, AODA, domestic violence, education, mental and behavioral health, and county management were present to share insights and knowledge across professions to enhance the QSR protocol for Wisconsin’s needs. Currently, Human Systems and Outcomes Inc. of Florida is developing the Wisconsin QSR instrument, based on the feedback of the design team. The draft Wisconsin QSR instrument was presented to the design team at its August 24, 2005 meeting.

The Wisconsin QSR instrument will be piloted in Pierce County during the week of September 12, 2005, and again in Washington County the week of September 28, 2005. For the pilots, Wisconsin will again bring in a team of certified reviewers from Alabama, Florida, and Iowa who will function as coaches to the CQI Specialists. This is designed to allow the CQI Specialists, and selected peer reviewers from the state and county, to become certified QSR reviewers. Based on the pilot reviews, the Wisconsin QSR protocol will be finalized in October 2005. The CQI Team and peer reviewers on the pilots will work with Human Systems and Outcomes in October 2005 to refine the instrument for application in the statewide review process that will start in Quarter 5.

Simultaneously with the QSR case reviews, when feasible, the Children's Court Initiative (CCI) will perform a review of the county court CHIPS and TPR processes when the county child welfare program is reviewed by the CQI Team. The CCI court reviews will examine court case records to assess the timeliness and effectiveness of court hearings to ensure safety and achieve permanency.

26. Defining Staff Training Requirements (R.1)

In May 2005, the recommendations from the ad hoc committee on child welfare training were introduced to the State Child Welfare Training Council for their preliminary consideration and discussion. The recommendations pertain to establishing pre-service, foundation, ongoing and supervisory training requirements that DCFS will implement through administrative rule. These recommendations were formally considered and called to a vote at the July 2005 Training Council meeting. The following recommendations were passed by the Training Council:

- There can be no "primary" assignment of cases to a caseworker until the completion of pre-service training. The new pre-service curriculum will cover the essential information needed for child welfare case practice.
- DCFS may approve exceptions to the pre-service requirement for specific pre-service content areas for child welfare caseworkers with a BSW and/or MSW degree from a CSWE-accredited program that has agreed to meet requirements for pre-service.
- Caseworkers must complete foundation or CORE training within the first two years of their employment. The existing CORE curriculum develops the essential competencies for child welfare case practice.
- DCFS may approve exceptions to the CORE requirement for specific CORE content areas for child welfare caseworkers with a BSW and/or MSW degree from a CSWE-accredited program that has agreed to meet the requirements for CORE training.
- Caseworkers must complete a minimum of 30 hours of in-service or ongoing training in child welfare every two years.

Recommendations for supervisory foundation and ongoing training requirements were sent back by the Training Council to the ad hoc committee for further review and clarification before the next Training Council meeting in September 2005.

The ad hoc committee is meeting in September 2005 to finalize their training recommendations. The Training Partnerships are currently working on developing web-based curriculum for the pre-service content areas.

27. eWiSACWIS Training (R.3)

The State Child Welfare Training Council voted at the July 2005 meeting to establish an eWiSACWIS training ad hoc committee. This ad hoc committee, co-chaired by Chris Sieck and Beth Wydeven, will begin working to integrate eWiSACWIS training methods with the new pre-service and existing CORE and ongoing/in-service training sessions. The committee will also address the need for ongoing eWiSACWIS refresher courses. The eWiSACWIS ad hoc committee will meet prior to the September 2005 Training Council Meeting to develop a committee charge. Throughout Quarter 3, members of the eWiSACWIS project have been working to help integrate eWiSACWIS considerations into pre-service training modules. The existing eWiSACWIS web-based training modules for new worker training will be used as part of the overall pre-service training.

Quarter 4 Activities

1. Number of Siblings in Placement (E.3)

The OHC Committee's Services to Foster Families workgroup has begun discussion of this item by outlining and comparing all of the limits for the number of children in foster care, treatment foster care, and group homes. In addition to the specific requirements for the number of children in care, the workgroup also discussed requirements in licensing standards that related directly to the number of children or people in the foster home, such as the ratio of number of bathrooms to number of residents, square footage requirements for general and bedroom space, and the number of children and adults who can receive care.

In addition, members have gathered information from other states related to the capacity of foster homes and, more specifically, sibling groups. At the August meeting, the OHC Committee will discuss this item further and outline potential policy changes, including possible changes to Ch. HFS 56.

2. Ongoing Standards -- Family Participation in Developing the Case Plan (F.1.b.)

At the end of Quarter 3, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee began revisions to the Ongoing Services Standards. Specifically, the committee is looking at ways to promote family participation in developing the case plan. Preliminary revisions have been made to the Ongoing Standards and a draft circulated for review. The committee will continue with revisions and post a draft of the standards to the Bulletin Board during Quarter 4. The committee will continue with revisions in Quarter 5 as guided by committee members, comments made to the Bulletin Board, and WCHSA. The Family Participation policy will be issued as part of the revised Ongoing Service Standards in January 2006 (Quarter 5) and become effective in June 2006 (Quarter 6), as described in Action Step N.2

3. ICWA Monitoring (G.3)

DCFS will monitor compliance with ICWA in two primary ways: 1) incorporating ICWA requirements into the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) program, through inclusion in the Quality Service Review (QSR) protocol; and 2) as an ongoing responsibility of the DCFS Indian Child Welfare Consultant position who will work with counties and tribes. In addition, DCFS created an eWiSACWIS ICWA notification report in eWiSACWIS that will provide data on placement cases involving Indian children, and will use other eWiSACWIS data on both in-home and out-of-home care cases.

DCFS will also continue to meet bi-monthly with the Indian child welfare managers of Wisconsin's 11 tribes who identify issues related to ICWA that arise in the counties. DHFS Area Administrative staff also are involved in ICWA monitoring activities.

4. Family Member Engagement (H.1.)

During Quarter 4, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee will begin to look at enhancing efforts to identify, locate, and engage family members by developing policy/criteria. The policy/criteria will define what constitutes sufficient effort to identify and locate relatives and when throughout the case process to pursue identification and location of relatives. In addition, committee members will identify tools caseworkers can use to conduct a relative search. The committee will continue to work on this through Quarters 4 & 5. DCFS will implement the policy/criteria through standard training and technical assistance for child welfare supervisors in Quarter 6.

5. BMCW Comprehensive Review (Q.4)

The review activities for the BMCW 2005 Comprehensive Review began in August 2005 and will continue through October 2005. The procedures have again been designed to replicate the procedures used by the CFSR in that: 1) the review covered cases in a variety of programs; 2) interviews with case managers and case participants were arranged; and 3) cases were given ratings based on qualitative measures. Community members and professionals familiar with the child welfare system were recruited to participate as reviewers as well. The review questions and tools directed reviewers to give special attention to issues related to child safety, permanence, and well-being as they apply to particular programs.

BMCW staff continue to participate in the PEP CQI Committee and to work with DCFS staff to advance efforts to reliably cross-match and integrate evaluation efforts between the BMCW Comprehensive Review tool and the CQI review tool.

6. Develop CQI Case Reviewers (Q.5)

The QSR, when compared to the CFSR, is a more extensive and structured process. The CQI Specialists and the CQI Manager have been invited by the State of Iowa to participate in a QSR Review in Council Bluffs, which will further assist in their achieving certification status as case review “mentors.” The CQI team will be in Council Bluffs, Iowa, during the week of August 29-September 2, 2005.

The Management Group (TMG), the consultant group to DCFS on the development of the statewide CQI system, will assist DCFS in planning the development of a statewide peer reviewer network to participate in the statewide QSR review process starting in Quarter 5. The planning activities will be accomplished in Quarter 4.

PEP Data

The data required for the PEP includes information on state performance relative to national standards relating to safety and permanency as well as progress on the CFSR case review outcome items for which Wisconsin established improvement targets.

The PEP data will come from several sources, including eWISACWIS reports specifically designed for PEP performance measurement, eWISACWIS data submitted for federal AFCARS and NCANDS purposes, results from the state CQI case reviews, and other data collection methods.

1. Status of NCANDS and AFCARS Reporting

DCFS will submit its first NCANDS Child and Agency Files for the FFY 2005 reporting period in March 2006. At this point, the federal ACF will be able to use the FFY 2005 Child File to compute state performance on safety national standards. Until the FFY 2005 file is available, state performance continues to be estimated based on state data. State performance cannot be computed using prior year NCANDS data because the state submitted only the Summary Data Component (SDC) information.

As of July 2004, all counties had implemented the eWiSACWIS system and data used to measure state performance for PEP implementation thus far has been drawn from the eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care reports. DCFS continues to work with the federal NCANDS contractor (Walter R. McDonald and Associates) to address questions related to the NCANDS files. In addition, DCFS has begun design and development of a NCANDS data error report to better monitor and address data quality and practice issues. This report will be finalized and available to the BMCW and county agencies in December 2005.

The state continues to improve the quality of the AFCARS Foster Care data. With reference to adoption discharge data captured in the AFCARS Foster Care File, DCFS has identified cases where the child's latest removal date is inaccurate. These cases will be corrected using the new Placement History Correction functionality described in the last PEP Quarterly Update. This project will be completed by September 2005. In addition, DCFS is enhancing its AFCARS Error Report, for both Foster Care and Adoption File data elements, to improve the accessibility of the list of cases with AFCARS errors and the error types. The report is being modified to provide a more user-friendly list of cases and errors directly to child welfare supervisors and staff.

For most of the period of Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2000 – 2004, DCFS submitted a “blended” AFCARS foster care file consisting of data from eWiSACWIS and the legacy HSRS Substitute Care Module depending on what system counties used to report placements. Conversion to eWiSACWIS was completed in July 2004 and the FFY 2004B file submitted in November 2004 was the first AFCARS file to use 100% eWiSACWIS information. The FFY 2004B file was also the first file to use encrypted case numbers for AFCARS reporting purposes, which will facilitate federal matching of semi-annual AFCARS files to create an annual file.

Wisconsin has historically had a high rate of “dropped cases” from the AFCARS annual file when the two six-month periods are merged. These dropped cases can affect the state performance on time to

reunification and time to adoption performance measures. Introduction of the encrypted case numbers will reduce the extent that cases are dropped in the annual file creation.

2. State Performance on National Standards

Included with the Quarter 3 progress report is updated information on state performance on the six national safety and permanency performance standards. Wisconsin met two of the six performance standards for the federal CFSR and minimum improvement targets were established in the PEP for the other four standards. Data is shown for all six performance standards.

The state baselines for the PEP are currently based on the FFY 2003 AFCARS annual file for permanency standards and state CY 2003 data for the safety standards. The minimum improvement targets were agreed to as part of federal approval of the PEP and must be achieved by the end of the two-year PEP period.

The update is based on the FFY 2004 permanency data profile sent to DCFS based on FFY 2004 AFCARS file (AB file), preliminary FFY 2004/FFY 2005 AFCARS file (BA file), state 2004 safety data from eWiSACWIS, and preliminary state 2005 safety data. The following chart shows the updated state performance information thus far in the two-year PEP period. After the chart is an analysis of the performance trends for each of the national standards.

DRAFT

Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards

Performance Standards	National Standard (Percent)	WI Data 2002 (Percent)	WI Data 2003 (Percent)	Minimum Improvement Target (Percent)	WI Data 2004 (Percent)	WI Data 2005 (Preliminary) (Percent)
Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment report, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.04	7.13	6.23	5.25	4.97
Safety Outcome 1 – Maltreatment While in Care Of all children in out-of-home care, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.26	0.30	Standard Met	0.57	0.62
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care Of all children who entered out-of-home care, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	22.2	21.5	20.15	18.9	21.5
Permanency Outcome 1 – Timely Reunification Of all children reunified from out-of-home care, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	66.5	65.2	67.62	70.1	79.8
Permanency Outcome 1 – Timely Adoption Of all children adopted from out-of-home, what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into out-of-home care?	32.0 or more	17.5	17.8	20.7	21.7	31.1*
Permanency Outcome 1 – Placement Stability Of all children in out-of-home care for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	92.3	92.6	Standard Met	90.5	90.7

Data Sources:

-- Safety Outcomes- 2002-2003 data are based on estimates derived from alternate methodology approved by the federal Children's Bureau; the 2004 & preliminary 2005 figures are derived solely from eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out of Home Care Outcome reports.

-- Permanency Outcomes- 2002-2004 and preliminary 2005 data are based on data profile figures generated by the federal Children's Bureau using the state's FFY AFCARS submissions; preliminary 2005 data is based on AFCARS files from the 2004B and 2005A reporting periods.

* Time to Adoption Data from the federal State Data Profile includes adoptions with incorrect removal dates; efforts to correct removal dates will be completed by September 2006

3. Analysis of State Performance

Safety Outcome - Recurrence of Maltreatment

Based on the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report for preliminary 2005 (7/1/04 - 6/30/05 period) results, the estimated state performance for the Recurrence of Maltreatment Standard is a 4.97% recurrence rate. This represents a decrease from the estimated 5.25% rate for CY 2004. The CY 2004 and 2005 calculations are done using the eWiSACWIS report code approved by ACF which measures subsequent recurrence only during the reporting period and truncates the measure at the end of the reporting period. The CY 2004 estimate does not reflect the full extent of recurrence as some counties implemented eWiSACWIS during CY 2004 and some CY 2004 case findings were not completed in the system at the time the data was generated. The eWiSACWIS data captures all maltreatment findings for preliminary CY 2005 for case findings that have been completed in the system.

While the CY 2004 estimate is probably lower than the actual state performance, the recurrence rate for the preliminary 2005 period suggests Wisconsin is likely to meet the PEP improvement target of 6.23%. Changes were made on how abuse and neglect reports related to mutual sexual contact between children are handled beginning in January 2005. These reports will be treated as service intakes rather than CPS reports. The DCFS will continue to analyze the CY 2004 and preliminary 2005 data to better understand the reasons for the change in performance versus the previous methodology.

In addition, during Quarter 3 DCFS completed an in-depth analysis of the results of the CY 2002 and 2003 surveys on maltreatment recurrence. This analysis is attached to the Quarter 3 progress report and will be used with DCFS policy staff and local agencies to identify ways to reduce the recurrence of maltreatment. DCFS is currently using CY 2004 maltreatment recurrence data from eWiSACWIS to develop a similar analysis for all recurrence cases and analyze recurrence trends on a county-by-county basis.

Safety Outcome - Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care

Based on the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report for preliminary 2005 (7/1/04 - 6/30/05 period) results, the estimated state performance is 0.63%, which is slightly over the national performance standard for Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care. Performance for this period represents a slight increase over the CY 2004 rate of 0.57% and reflects the year-to-year fluctuations that occur with this measure.

Unlike the other national standards which are based on large numbers of cases, this measure is based on a very small number of cases and thus is highly sensitive to fluctuations in the number of maltreatment reports involving foster parents and facility staff. For example, the increase from 0.57% in CY 2004 to 0.63% for preliminary 2005 is attributable to five children, so a single child has an approximately 0.01% impact on the measure.

Permanency Outcomes – Re-entry, Reunification, Adoption, and Placement Stability

The performance for these four permanency measures is based on the recent permanency profile for Wisconsin generated by ACF from AFCARS data using the FFY 2004B file and the FFY 2005A file to create a “2005 BA” annualized file. DCFS is working with ACF to replicate the permanency profile at the state level and compare the federal performance calculations with the results of the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome reports for the four permanency national standards.

The DCFS understands that data submitted to AFCARS for some children continues to result in data being excluded from the outcome calculations. In addition, the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Reports for these standards have provided different results for the four permanency standards. To better understand the impact of excluding cases in the federal outcome calculations and the discrepancies between the AFCARS-based permanency data profile and comparable state eWiSACWIS reports, the DCFS has received a file from ACF indicating all the AFCARS records that were not included in the above state profile. The data contained in this file will be used to examine the reasons for exclusion and to identify strategies to correct and improve data quality.

Overall, the extent of fluctuation in the AFCARS permanency measures from FFY 2004 (FFY 2004A and FFY 2004B) period to the 2005BA (FFY 2004B and FFY 2005A) period indicate that analysis is needed of how records within the AFCARS files are being used in the calculations. Full statewide implementation of eWiSACWIS was completed during FFY 2004 and the FFY 2004B file was the first one to use encrypted case numbers. Both factors could cause changes in how records are used within the AFCARS files for the calculations.

Re-entry to Care – The 2005BA permanency data profile shows an increase in the re-entry rate compared with FFY 2004. This may be attributable to increasing numbers of counties recording juvenile detention and shelter placements in eWiSACWIS that affect the re-entry rate. Analysis will continue to be conducted by DCFS as part of the above data quality review and using the Targeted Case Review results from PEP Action Step C to better understand how the re-entry data and program factors affect re-entry, including the impact on specific case types.

Timely Reunification - The 2005BA permanency data profile shows a significant increase in the timeliness of reunification rate compared with FFY 2004. Results for both periods show a reverse of the trend of decreasing timeliness from FFYs 2001 – 2003, so analysis will be done to compare results from these periods to prior results. The increased number of juvenile detention and shelter placements would have a positive impact on the timeliness of reunification measure as such placements are very short-term in duration. Other factors could include the use of encrypted case numbers for both parts of the 2005BA period and edits made to the eWiSACWIS system during 2004 to improve reporting of discharges.

Timely Adoption - The 2005BA permanency data profile shows a significant increase in the timeliness rate compared with FFY 2004. This continues the trend started in FFY 2004 of increased timeliness compared with FFYs 2001 – 2003. In addition to general AFCARS reporting issues described above, the DCFS has identified that many cases in both FFY 2004 and 2005BA periods have incorrect removal data for AFCARS element #21. The cases have been identified and will be corrected using the state's new placement correction functionality developed within eWiSACWIS by September 2006. Other factors affecting performance could be that the number of adoptions increased rapidly during 2001 – 2003 with large numbers of the adoptions being foster home conversions of children in care for extended periods, particularly in Milwaukee. These “old” cases would negatively impact the timeliness measure. Adoptions have decreased going into 2005, reflecting more of a “normal” level of adoption activity.

Placement Stability - The 2005BA permanency data profile shows essentially the same results in the placement stability rate compared with FFY 2004. The rate is lower than 2002 – 2003, but Wisconsin still meets this national performance standard. Analysis has been initiated to confirm the state assumption that more complete reporting of placements in eWiSACWIS versus the legacy HSRS system is showing the true state performance for this standard versus the legacy data that overstated state performance. In addition, the Targeted Case Review results will provide a better understanding of the data and program factors affecting the placement stability rate.

Adjustments to State Baselines for National Standards – At this point, Wisconsin does not propose adjustments to the state baseline performance levels used to compute performance improvement targets for the PEP. An adjustment may be warranted for the timeliness to adoption measure, but additional data clean-up activity and data analysis is needed before determining if the baseline should be adjusted.

PEP eWiSACWIS Performance Reports

The performance reports used for the PEP include two sets of reports. The first set of Federal Outcome Reports replicate the national performance standards for safety and permanency using data directly from eWiSACWIS rather than the AFCARS and NCANDS files. The PEP Performance Reports are used to measure the impact of PEP Action Steps for several safety, permanency and well being items.

Federal Outcome Reports – The reports were updated in Quarters 1 and 2 to ensure consistency with the federal national standards report syntax, improve report accuracy, and facilitate county use of the reports via the Reports Dashboard. The reports will be run on a quarterly and annualized basis and serve as the primary data source to monitor performance on the national safety and permanency performance standards. Continued efforts are being made to analyze differences in the eWiSACWIS permanency outcome reports versus the federal calculations using AFCARS data.

Reports Dashboard – The Reports Dashboard was implemented on June 27, 2005. The web-based Reports Dashboard allows local agencies to access the federal Outcome Report information in an easy-to-use graphical format. The Reports Dashboard has been well received during the regional roundtable sessions conducted with local agency directors and supervisors during June and July 2005. Further development has been initiated on the Reports Dashboard to improve the functionality to sort information and make the data more accessible. These enhancements will be completed by the end of September 2005. Based on the regional sessions, there is strong support by counties to use the Dashboard approach for data presentation and DCFS will add the PEP Performance Reports to the Dashboard as resources permit.

eWiSACWIS PEP Reports - Development and testing work for the newly-designed PEP reports was completed in June 2005 and the reports were implemented and made accessible to county agencies and state staff on June 27, 2005. Several regional report roundtable sessions were held in June and July 2005 with follow up at child welfare regional meetings in August 2005 to introduce the PEP reports and the Reports Dashboard to county agency directors and supervisors. The reports are run on a monthly and/or quarterly basis and on an annualized basis using a rolling 12 months, so that for each quarter the performance for the past 12 months can be computed.

The PEP Reports include statewide summary information, county summary information, county case detail in an Excel worksheet that can be sorted for further analysis, and an all-county comparison. These reports are being used, in conjunction with results from the case reviews, to serve as a primary or secondary data source to measure the state's performance in specific areas related to the PEP Action Steps and to the CFSR Performance Items. The PEP Reports address the following measures as either a primary or secondary data source as follows:

PEP Performance Measure	PEP Report Name	Primary Performance Data Source	Secondary Performance Data Source
Safety			
Timeliness of CPS Initial Assessments	CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Safety Assessments, Plans and Services	CPS Safety	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency			
Timeliness of ASFA Documentation	ASFA Documentation	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Completeness of ICWA Notification	ICWA Notification	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Sibling Placement	Siblings in Placement	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Independent Living Assessment and Planning	Independent Living	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Well Being			
Timeliness of Family Assessments & Case Planning	Family Assessments and Case Plans	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Monthly Contacts for Ongoing Cases	Contacts with Children and Parents	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Education Screen for Ongoing Cases	Education Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Medical/MH Screen for Ongoing Cases	Medical Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report

The DCFS is currently developing a plan to provide ongoing communication and technical assistance to county agency staff. The plan includes efforts to ensure staff access the PEP Reports, understand how data is included in the report, and address ongoing report maintenance and enhancement needs. Improvements are currently being made to the case detail worksheets to facilitate the use of the worksheets to help counties identify cases with incomplete/inaccurate information that affects individual county performance. Detailed guides to each of the reports are also available to help counties work with staff on data entry, showing eWiSACWIS screen shots to identify how data entered by workers shows up in the reports.

The next stage of PEP report development will include a new report on permanency plan goals for PEP Action Step D and CFSR Item 7. The DCFS has begun analysis of how to modify an existing eWiSACWIS ad hoc report used by BMCW to monitor the status of permanency planning efforts and goal setting for statewide use. The report provides data on the timeliness and completion of permanency plans, the status of the permanency goal and changes to permanency goals over time. Like the PEP Reports, this report will be made available through eWReports and will be run on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis. DCFS anticipates making the new report available statewide in October 2005.

Changes to PEP Matrix

The following changes were made to the PEP Matrix reflecting activity through the end of Quarter 3. See the updated Matrix attached to this report for more information.

1. A.1 Scope of CPS Intervention

The effective date for the new Access Standards was originally targeted for January 2006 (Q5) on the assumption that changes to eWiSACWIS would be initiated in July 2005 (Q3) and ready by December 2005 (Q5). The system changes related to Access are significant, as the changes will streamline the workflow for CPS agencies by creating a single intake process for types of CPS reports and child welfare service intakes. The eWiSACWIS changes will not be implemented until March 2006, thus the effective date of the Access Standards will be delayed to March 2006 (Q6). The completion dates for benchmarks A.1.b through A.1.d are modified accordingly.

2. B.1 Safety Assessment and Planning

The Safety Standards will be issued in Q5 rather than in Q4 to follow issuance of the Access Standards in Q4. The Safety Standards will introduce new concepts and practices for CPS staff to assess and manage child safety. Many of the changes in the Safety Standards will be a large shift in practice and issuing them in the same quarter as the Access Standard (which also makes major changes to current practice) will overwhelm CPS staff. Also, issuing the standards in Q5 will be closer to the eWiSACWIS release regarding changes to the safety assessment and plan, therefore, better supporting implementation of the standards. The completion date for benchmark B.1.a is clarified and the completion date for benchmark B.1.b is modified accordingly.

3. C.1 Re-entry to Placement and C.2 Placement Stability Targeted Case Reviews

The targeted case reviews for re-entry to placement and placement stability were completed in Q3 as scheduled. Analysis of the results of the reviews will take more time than originally anticipated and the analysis will be completed in Q4. The analysis will be used to make policy recommendations in the later portion of Q4. The completion dates for benchmarks C.1.a.4 and C.2.a.4 are modified accordingly.

4. D.1 and O.3 Concurrent Plan Requirement

Based on recommendations by the PEP Out-of-Home Care Committee, the requirement to establish a concurrent plan will be effective at the 12-month permanency review rather than the 6-month review. Concurrent planning will be encouraged from the beginning of the out-of-home placement. The concurrent plan policy will be part of a larger DCFS Numbered Memo covering several permanency planning topics that will be issued in Q4. The benchmarks are renumbered to clarify the committee role and the completion dates for benchmarks D.1.2, D.1.3, and O.3.1 are modified accordingly. The old benchmarks D.1.3 and O.3.3 are deleted as they duplicate the actions described in the measurement method.

5. D.2 Permanency Plan Procedures
The benchmarks are revised to explain the policy issues that will be clarified and the role of the Out-of-Home Care Committee. The clarification will be done through a DCFS Numbered Memo, the same memo for benchmark D.1. The completion date is modified accordingly.
6. D.3 Permanency Plan Reviews
The materials for permanency plan reviews are still being developed and will be completed in Q4.
7. D.4 Permanency Issues
The benchmarks are revised to explain the policy issues that will be clarified and the role of the Out-of-Home Care Committee. The clarification will be done through a DCFS Numbered Memo, the same memo for benchmark D.1. The completion date is modified accordingly.
8. D.5 Foster and Adoptive Family Assessment
Benchmark D.5.b.2 is revised to focus on technical assistance to counties for use of the combined assessment rather than compliance since use of the combined assessment will not be required.
9. D.6 Permanency Measurement
The development of an eWiSACWIS report for permanency planning was not completed during the initial phase of PEP report development and will be completed in Q4.
10. E.1 Case Documentation
The materials for documentation of efforts to place siblings together are still being developed and will be completed in Q4.
11. E.4 Measurement of Placement With Siblings
The measurement method is revised to reflect the development of an eWiSACWIS report on placement of siblings.
12. F.1, J.1 and N.2 Ongoing Service Standards
The eWiSACWIS changes related to the revision of the Ongoing Service Standards will be significant, with modifications to simplify the family assessment and case plan. The eWiSACWIS changes will not be implemented until June 2006, thus the effective date of the revised Ongoing Service Standards will be delayed to June 2006 (Q7). The completion dates for benchmarks F.1.b, J.1.a.2, J.1.a.4, N.2.4 and N.2.5 are modified accordingly.
13. F.2 ICWA Notification
The ICWA notification forms were developed with tribes and included in eWiSACWIS in Q1. The DCFS Numbered Memo on the ICWA notification process is still being developed and will be completed in Q4. Training and technical

assistance activities are contingent on the on the ICWA specialist position being filled, which is expected in Q4. The completion dates for benchmarks F.2.1 through F.2.4 are modified accordingly.

14. F.3 Measurement of Preserving Connections

The measurement method for CFSR Item 14, preserving connections, is revised to clarify that the case review process applies to preserving connections in general. The measurement method for ICWA is described under Action Step G.

15. G.1 ICWA Requirements

The methods to communicate ICWA requirements are clarified. The DCFS Numbered Memo will address ICWA requirements, including ICWA notification under benchmark F.2.

16. G.2 Indian Child Welfare Position

The timing for refilling the DCFS Indian Child Welfare consultant position is changed to Q4.

17. G.4 Measurement for ICWA Requirements

The measurement method is revised to clarify the development of an eWiSACWIS report for ICWA monitoring purposes. The limited case reviews conducted in Q3 will not provide meaningful information on compliance with ICWA requirements. ICWA requirements will be addressed in the ongoing case reviews.

18. H.2 Sharing Information

The guidelines/policy regarding information sharing with relatives will be completed in Q4. Based on the legal opinion identifying limits on sharing information with relatives, DCFS will develop a legislative proposal to expand information sharing. The proposal will be submitted to the Department for consideration.

19. H.4 Relative Placement Survey

The survey is still being developed and will be completed in Q4.

20. J.1 Ongoing Service Standards

The date for establishing the workgroup is changed to Q3 to be consistent with benchmark N.2. The effective date for the revised standards and other activities are changed to reflect eWiSACWIS modifications being ready in Q7.

21. L.1 and L.2 Managed Care Pilot

The managed care organization has been selected and implementation is expected in early 2006. The completion dates for the benchmarks are modified accordingly and responsibilities for implementation are clarified.

22. O.1 Adoptive Resource

DCFS completed statutory research confirming that an adoptive resource is not required prior to termination of parental rights (TPR) in Quarter 1 and this

information has been communicated to counties at the regional level by state permanency consultants. The final form will be issued in Quarter 3 using a DCFS Information Memo. The information memo has been drafted and is awaiting final approval. Specific language related to the Indian Child Welfare Act requested by tribal staff was added.

23. O.5 Memo on Legal Services

The memo will be completed in Q4.

24. O.6 Measurement of TPR Process

The use of the county court reviews and the case review process under Action Step Q as measurement methods are clarified.

25. P.3 Measurement of Participation in Hearings

The survey process will begin in Q4.

26. Q.3 – Q.5 Quality Assurance System

The benchmarks for Q.2 through Q.5 are reordered so that Q.2 concentrates on development of the case review process, Q.4 on integration of statewide and Milwaukee processes, and Q.5 on peer reviewer recruitment. The targeted case review approach is clarified in benchmark Q.2.3. The automation of the QA review format and tools will be delayed until Q8 to allow for adjustments to be made to the case review process during the initial implementation phase before automating the format and tools.

27. R.3 eWiSACWIS Training

The training workgroup was formed in Q3. DCFS will not establish a eWiSACWIS training coordinator position, so the old benchmark R.3.b is deleted. System-related training will be coordinated using existing staff, including the eWiSACWIS Project Team and the state training coordinator contractor position established prior to PEP implementation.

28. T.1 Service Array Survey

The workgroup to develop the survey will be established in Q4 and the analysis of survey results will continue into Q5.